

### REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-7, and 32 are pending. Claim 1 has been amended, claims 8-31 have been canceled, and new claim 32 has been added to recite additional features of the embodiments disclosed in the specification. The rejection under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as been obviated by the cancellation of claim 16.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons.

Claims 1, 5-8, 10, 12-14, 16, 18, 21-29, and 31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) for being obvious in view of a Sakita-APA combination. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that “each of the remaining sub-fields other than the initial sub-field has a higher brightness weighting value than the initial sub-field.” These features are not taught or suggested by the Sakita patent or APA. Moreover, the Matsumoto patent does not teach or suggest these features.

On pages 22-25 of the Office Action, the Matsumoto patent was relied on to reject claim 4, the subject matter of which has now been added to claim 1. The Examiner indicated that the features of claim 4 may be found in Figure 13 of Matsumoto - i.e., the notations 2<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>5</sup>, etc. show that latter sub-fields have higher brightness weighting values than the initial sub-fields.

However, the notations 2<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>5</sup>, etc., do not correspond to brightness weighting values, but rather indicate that the latter sub-fields have longer sustain periods than earlier sub-fields. See column 23, lines 30-33, of Matsumoto which discloses: the subfield designated by ‘20’ has a shortest sustain discharge period, while the subfield designated ‘27’ has a longest sustained discharge period. Thus, Matsumoto makes clear that the remaining sub-fields have a longer

Serial No. 10/757,477  
Amdt. dated March 27, 2008  
Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2007

Docket No. YHK-0131

sustained discharge period than the initial sub-field. However, Matsumoto does not teach or suggest that “each of the remaining sub-fields other than the initial sub-field has a **higher brightness weighting value** than the initial sub-field.”

New claim 32 has been added to the application. Claim 32 recites that the initial sub-field has a brightness weighting value less than one half a maximum brightness weighting value. (See, for example, page 15 of the specification for support). These features are not taught or suggested by the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination.

In view of the foregoing differences, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over a Sakita-APA combination, whether taken alone or in combination with Matsumoto. Furtherance of claim 1 and its dependent claims to allowance is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and timely allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and

Serial No. 10/757,477

Docket No. YHK-0131

Amdt. dated March 27, 2008

Reply to Office Action of December 27, 2007

please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186

Samuel W. Ntiros  
Registration No. 39,318

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 DYK/SWN/kzw  
**Date:** March 27, 2008

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**